REMARKS

Claims 1-19, 21, 22, 24-32, 34 and 36-40 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated September 5, 2008, claims 1-19, 21, 22, 24-32, 34 and 36-40 were rejected.

Applicants herein amend claims 1-12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 34, 36 and 38-40. Claims 15, 17, 18, 25-29 and 37 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 41-43 are added herein.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections, are requested.

Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

A supplemental information disclosure statement is submitted herewith including the copies of references. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate the consideration of the references submitted herewith in the next communication to the Applicants.

Further, the present application is a continuation-in-part application of U.S. Patent Applications Nos. 09/900,484 and 10/642,532. Under MPEP 609.02, the information which has been considered by the Office in a parent application should be considered when examining such continuation-in-part applications. It is not necessary for submission of a duplicative information disclosure statement in the continuation application. See MPEP 609.02 and 2001.06(b). In addition, there should be an indication be provided in the first Office Action whether the prior art in the parent application has been reviewed. See MPEP 2001.06(b). However, there is no such indication in the Office Action as to whether the prior art in the parent applications 09/900,484 and 10/642,532 have been reviewed.

Therefore, a request is now made for consideration of the information disclosure statements filed in the parent applications 09/900,484 and 10/642,532, and indicate in the next Office Action whether such information disclosure statements have been considered.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

A. Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-32, 34 and 36-38

In 9th paragraph of the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-32, 34 and 36-38 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,478 to Pogossiants et al. ("Pogossiants") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,320,948 to Heilmann et al. ("Heilmann").[1] The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-14, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38 is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments. Claims 15, 17, 18, 25-29 and 37 are cancelled, and thus, rejection of these claims is now moot.

Independent claim 1, as amended, specifically recites:

> a first processor-based system coupled to a plurality of telephone terminals disposed within said prison facility, the first processor-based system disposed at the prison facility, said first processor-based system transmitting first voice signals associated with one or more of said plurality of telephone terminals via a digital data link; and
>
> a second processor-based system coupled to said first processor-based system and disposed remotely from said prison facility, said second processor-based system establishing calls to called parties . . . the second processor-based system converting second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals from the called parties received via the carrier network to second VoIP voice signals for transmission to the first processor-based system via the digital data link, ***the second processor-based system monitoring the unconverted second voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls***. (emphasis added)

[1] Although 9th paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action states that these claims are unpatentable over Pogossiants in view of Heilmann, the Office Action does not specifically state any reason for citing Heilmann. Applicants assume this to be an oversight, and address Heilmann in the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 34 and 36-38 -32. If the Examiner maintains this rejection in the next Office Action, the Examiner is requested to provide specific reasons for citing Heilmann.

Per claim 1, the call processing system includes a first processor-based system and a second processor-based system. The first processor-based system is located within the prison facility whereas the second processor-based system is located remotely from the prison facility. The first processor-based system and the second processor-based system are coupled by a digital data link to transmit digital versions of voice signals. The second processor-based system receives first voice signals from the first processor-based system and transmits the first voice signals over a carrier network. The second processor-based system also receives second non-VoIP voice signals from the carrier network and converts the second non-VoIP voice signals into second VoIP voice signals. The detection of fraudulent or unauthorized call activity is performed on the second non-VoIP voice signals.

The feature of "the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls" is advantageous because detection of the fraudulent or unauthorized call activity can be enhanced by processing the voice signals that are not degraded by conversion (e.g., compression and packetizing) for transmitting the voice signals over the digital data link. The conversion for transmission over the digital data link may involve lossy compression and packetizing of data that may adversely affect the accuracy of fraudulent or unauthorized call detection. By performing the detection of fraudulent or unauthorized call detection without minimal or no conversion, the fraudulent or unauthorized call activity may be detected more accurately.

Pogossiants fails to disclosure this feature. In Figure 5, Pogossiants discloses two T-Servers, one integrated with a service control point (SCP) in a public switched telephone network (PSTN) and the other included in the call center communicating with the PSTN. See Pogossiants, col. 11, ll. 26-29. The T-Servers execute one or more computer-telephony

integration (CTI) applications including controlling routers according to routing rules. See Pogossiants, col. 11, ll. 12-25. Pogossiants, however, does not disclose that the CTI functions performed at the T-Server include detection of any fraudulent or unauthorized calls. Further, Pogossiants does not specifically disclose that any operations are performed on non-VoIP voice signals. Although Pogossiants describes that the T-Server in the PSTN executes one or more CTI applications, Pogossiants does not disclose that any of the CTI functions are performed on non-VoIP voice signals.

Neither does Heilmann disclose this feature. Heilmann discloses a telephone security system for controlling and logging access between end-user stations and a PSTN. See Heilmann, col. 1, ll. 12-16. Heilmann discloses detecting and analyzing call activity associated with calls. Specifically, Heilmann discloses a process for capturing call attributes (e.g., station extension identification, inbound caller-ID information, outbound number dialed, call type, and call content), analyzing the call attributes and consolidating the captured attributes for further processing. See Heilmann, col. 10, ll. 51-59. Heilmann, however, does not disclose that the security system detects fraudulent or unauthorized call activity. Therefore, Heilmann also fails to disclose the feature of "the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls" as recited in the claim 1, as amended.

Pogossiants and Heilmann fail to disclose the feature of "the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls" as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Pogossiants and Heilmann.

Claims 2-4 and 6-14 depend from claim 1; and therefore, the arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 2-4 and 6-14. Accordingly, claims 2-4 and 6-14 are also patentably distinguishable from Pogossiants and Heilmann.

Claim 8 is patentable for the additional reason that it recites "said call processing platform provides at least one of billing, validation or routing associated with calls made via a third processor-based system." This feature is advantageous because billing, validation or routing may be processed centrally at the call processing platform. The prison facilities need not implement billing, validation or routing functions individually; and therefore, costs for performing these functions may be reduced. In Pogossiants, the T-Server at the PSTN appears to be connected to one call center. See Figure 1 of Pogossiants. Nowhere in Pogossiants does it disclose that the T-Server at the PSTN is connected to two or more call centers. Heilmann also fails to disclose this feature. Heilmann is directed to a security system deployed in one enterprise and does not involve call processing of multiple facilities. See Heilmann, col. 3, ll. 20-24. Therefore, claim 8 is patentably distinguishable from Pogossiants and Heilmann reciting the feature of "said call processing platform provides at least one of billing, validation or routing associated with calls made via a third processor-based system."

Claim 14 is patentable for the additional reason that it recites "wherein the fraudulent or unauthorized call activity comprises a three-way call." It is cited in the Office Action that Pogossiants discloses three-way call detection in column 20, ll. 12-28. The disclosure in this section of Pogossiants, however, relates to establishing legitimate multi-party connection between parties. In Pogossiants, the call processing system supports the three-way call between the parties, and therefore, there is no reason to detect and prevent the three-way call. Consequently, nowhere in Pogossiants does it disclose that the three-way call is detected. In

contrast, the three-way call as recited in claim 14 is prohibited or unauthorized, and therefore, the call processing system may detect and take remedial actions (e.g., discontinue call) against the three-way call. Neither does Heilmann disclose anything about detecting a fraudulent or unauthorized three-way call. Therefore, Pogossiants and Heilmann fail to disclose the feature of "wherein the fraudulent or unauthorized call activity comprises a three-way call." Therefore, claim 14 is patentable for the additional reason that it recites this feature.

Similarly, independent claim 21 recites the feature of "the call processing platform monitoring the second non-VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol) voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls . . . ." Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 21 and its dependent claims 22, 24 and 30-32. Accordingly, claims 21, 22, 24 and 30-32 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Pogossiants and Heilmann.

Independent claim 34 also recites the feature of "monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signal for fraudulent or unauthorized call activity." Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 34 and its dependent claims 36 and 38. Accordingly, claims 34 and its dependent claims 36 and 38 are also patentably distinguishable from the combination of Pogossiants and Heilmann.

B. Claim 5

In 10th paragraph of the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pogossiants in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,775 to Simpson ("Simpson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, and therefore, claim 5 incorporates the limitation of "the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect

fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls" recited in claim 1, as amended. Pogossiants fails to disclose this feature as set forth above for claim 1. Neither does Simpson disclose this feature. Simpson was cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing the use of PIN number verification. Nowhere in Simpson does it disclose detecting fraudulent or unauthorized call activity by monitoring non-VoIP voice signals. Therefore, claim 5 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of Pogossiants and Simpson.

C. Claims 19 and 40

In 11th paragraph of the Office Action, claims 19 and 40 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pogossiants in view of Heilmann. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1, and therefore, claim 19 incorporates the limitation of "the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls" recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 19.

Claim 40 depends from claim 34, and therefore, claim 40 incorporates the limitation of "monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signal for fraudulent or unauthorized call activity" recited in claim 34, as amended. Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth for claim 34 are equally applicable to claim 40.

D. Claims 16 and 39

In 12th paragraph of the Office Action, claims 16 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Pogossiants et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,985,478) in view of Aldous et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,722). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the amendments.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1, and therefore, claim 16 incorporates the limitation of "the second processor-based system monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signals to detect fraudulent or unauthorized call activity in the calls" recited in claim 1, as amended. Pogossiants fails to disclose this feature as set forth above for claim 1. Neither does Aldous disclose this feature. Aldous was cited in the Office Action merely for allegedly disclosing a speech recognition engine. Nowhere in Aldous does it disclose anything about detecting fraudulent or unauthorized call activity. Therefore, claim 16 is also patentably distinguishable from Pogossiants and Aldous.

Claim 39 depends from claim 34, and therefore, claim 39 incorporates the feature of "monitoring the second non-VoIP voice signal for fraudulent or unauthorized call activity." Therefore, essentially the same arguments set forth above for claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 39.

E. New claims 41-43

Claims 41-43 depend from claims 1, 21 and 34, respectively. Therefore the same arguments set forth above for claims 1, 21 and 34 are equally applicable to claims 41-43. Accordingly, claims 41-43 are also patentably distinguishable from the cited references.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that for at least these reasons claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36 and 38-40 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30-32, 34, 36, and 38-43, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Robert L. Rae, et al.

Date: February 4, 2009

By: /Dohyun Ahn/

Dohyun Ahn, Reg. No. 63,237
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7291
Fax: (650) 938-5200